

Remark

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 13, 16, 18-20 and 24 have been amended. Claim 5 has been previously canceled. Therefore, claims 1-4 and 6-24 are now presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection*Halavais in view of Sankaranarayan*

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 6-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Halavais et al., WO 00/65506 ("Halavais") in view of Sankaranarayan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,799,208 ("Sankaranarayan").

First, claim 1, as amended, recites "receiving information regarding two or more transactions at a transaction coordinator of a client." In contrast, Sankaranarayan at Abstract discloses "a resource manager."

Claim 1 further recites "two or more transactions representing discrete transactions for two or more reservations." In contrast, Sankaranarayan discloses "one or more resource consumers such as a system component or application." See Sankaranarayan at Abstract.

In addition, claim 1 recites having "different suppliers." However, Sankaranarayan at Abstract discloses "multiple resource providers." Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Sankaranarayan fails to disclose that two or more reservations are from different service providers.

Second, applicants respectfully submit that Sankaranarayan is in a different field of art, and thus it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine

Sankaranarayan with Halavais. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the amendments made to the claims do not raise new issues. Sankaranarayan relates to allocation of system resources within a computer system. See Sankaranarayan at col. 1, lines 34-42. In contrast, claim 1 relates to making reservations from different suppliers. One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Sankaranarayan in connection with claim 1. Therefore, Sankaranarayan is not an appropriate reference against claim 1.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the reference. Claims 6, 9, 13, 16 and 20 contain one or more of the limitations discussed above, among others, and are therefore believed to be allowable. The remaining claims are dependent upon one of the above claims and are believed to be allowable therefore as well as for the express limitations set forth in each claim, respectively.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.


Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: May 4, 2006


Gordon R. Lindeem III
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980

Docket No: 42390P10501
Application No: 09/753,033

12

BEST AVAILABLE COPY